THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

"*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men*" Luke, 2 14.

"*How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth Salvation.*" Isa 52. 7.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

VOL. II. SATURDAY, JAN. 15, 1824. NO. 23.

HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1825.

To the Rev. George S. Boardman.

DEAR SIR,

Many important reasons induce me to address you in this manner, at this time, among which are the following:

1st. I recently heard you deliver a funeral discourse, in which I think you did not afford the mourners that consolation which the scriptures abundantly furnish.

2d. There is a manifest impropriety in dwelling upon the doctrine of eternal misery on funeral occasions.

3d. In your discourse, according to my humble opinion, you misconstrued and misapplied the scriptures.

4th. You made a direct attack upon the doctrine of Universalism, which I am in duty bound, honorably and manfully to vindicate and defend.

5th. I find you decline controverting the doctrine of universal grace, when there is a suitable time and mode for a reply: but, safely entrenched behind the ramparts of your own desk, where common civility forbids any one to answer, you become a bold and powerful champion in favor of the endless torments of hell.

6th. I consider it to be my duty to embrace every fair opportunity to give or receive instruction concerning the things of the kingdom of God.

7th. I should be very grateful if you would reciprocate this favor in a similar way.

The above reasons appear to me, sir, to be sufficient. If you should think otherwise, I trust you will excuse the liberty I have taken, and allow that the purest motives dictated this letter. Should you remain silent as the grave, with respect to an answer, I shall have discharged my duty.

I must confess, sir, I felt some surprise when you named your text. 1 Cor. xv. 22. "*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" It was the first time that I ever heard that text taken by a Calvinist, on any occasion.—What, thought I, will the speaker do with that text! You first labored to show that the word *all* sometimes means only a part. To illustrate this, you referred to Luke i. 1. "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that *all* the world should be taxed." Here I conceive, you justly limited the meaning of the word *all*, to the dominions over which Cæsar Augustus ruled. You might have also cited Math. iii. 5, 6. "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and *all* Judea, and *all* the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan." Here the word *all* is evidently used in a *restricted* sense. You then stated that the word *all* sometimes means *Jews* and *Gentiles*. To confirm this statement, you quoted Titus ii. 11. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." I admit that in this passage, the word *all* signifies Jews and Gentiles; but I deny that there is any expression in connexion with this text, which *limits* the meaning or application of the word *all*. Had you examined your Greek testament, you would have found the true reading of this text to be the following: "*For the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared.*" After the above introductory remarks, you admitted that in your text, the word *all* is used in the most *unlimited* sense—that it is used *literally* and not *hyperbolically*. Permit me, sir, to suggest the following rule for understanding the word all in scripture. "Whenever we meet with the word *all*, in connexion with any point of *doctrine*, it *always* means literally and mathematically the whole, including all its parts; but where it is used *historically*, it frequently admits of limitation." If you can find an exception to the above rule in all the bible, I would thank you to point it out to me.

You laid down the following positions and undertook to support them:

1st. That all men die a natural death in Adam, or for what Adam did.

2dly. That all men will be made naturally alive in Christ; but that some will be raised to misery and damnation.

Your first position is untrue. I know it is a prevalent opinion, that mankind are subjected to natural death, or the dissolution of the body, in consequence of Adam's sin. But I am fully convinced that this opinion has no foundation in the scriptures of truth. Those who assert that the dissolution of mortal existence is the result of sin, are bound to prove it. On this subject, I apprehend no difficulty in proving the negative. Whoever attentively examines the structure of animal existence, must be convinced that *death* is the natural result of organic life. Whatever is composed of the eternally mutable elements of this world, must necessarily be subjected to decay, unless the *fiat* of Omnipotence should interpose. Suppose Adam had had his head severed from his body, previous to his commission of sin, would he not have died? If not, he must have been a very extraordinary being! If he would have died, then he was not originally *immortal*. Let us now examine the scripture account of the denunciation against sin, to ascertain if the death of the body were included. Gen. 3. 17, 18, 19. "And unto Adam he said, because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the *ground* for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till thou return unto the ground*." Here is the end of the sentence denounced. Reference is then made to a fixed, eternal principle of truth. The existence or non-existence of *sin* does not alter that truth. "For out of it wast thou taken: *dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*." It was just as true that Adam was taken out of the dust, and should *return* to the dust, *before*, as *after* transgression. Thus, sir, I have ascertained that the death of the body is not the consequence of sin, but the result of organical construction, and according to the original purpose of the Almighty. But what is meant by *Adam*, in your text? By the word Adam, in this instance, I understand, not solely the *person* of the first man; but the *earthly nature* in which all men are created. "The first *man* is of the *earth*, earthy. *As we* have borne the image of the *earthy*." &c. "In *Adam* all die." therefore, means, in the *Adamic* or *earthly* nature, all men die a natural death. There is no more propriety in saying we die *personally* in *Adam*, than there would be in saying *Adam* died *personally* in us. In the *Adamic* or *earthly* nature, men not only die naturally, but *spiritually*; though not in consequence of what *Adam* did, but in consequence of what they themselves do. Romans 5. 12. "Wherefore as by one man sin *entered* into the world, and death (*moral death*) by sin, and so death (moral or spiritual death) passed upon all men." Why? Was it because *Adam* sinned? No: but because "*all have sinned*." That it was *moral* or *spiritual* death only which Adam died in consequence of sin, is clearly shown by the language used to Adam. Gen. 2. 17. "In the *day* that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt *surely die*." Did Adam suffer natural death, or the dissolution of the body, in the very *day* he transgressed? He certainly did not.—Then if the words of God were true, *natural* death was not produced by sin—was not contained in the penalty of the law given, nor the judgment denounced.

I have been thus particular upon the first part of your text, because its whole force and application depends upon it; "For *as* in Adam all die *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive." You will have perceived by this time, sir, that being raised from the dead, is not all that is meant by being "made alive in Christ." I was much pleased with one part of your argument. You showed conclusively that all mankind would be made alive in Christ, in the same manner they died in Adam.—You insisted that the antithesis contained in the text is complete. "*As* in Adam all die, *even so*," (i. e. in like manner,) "in Christ shall all be made alive." Is it possible sir, that you could have entirely forgotten the *third* of the *five points* of Calvinism? Here is this celebrated *point*: and it is precisely in point, together with your conclusive argument to *annihilate* the doctrine of endless misery, to all intents and purposes. "Mankind are totally depraved, in consequence of the fall of the first man, who, being their public head, his sin involved the corruption of all his posterity; which *corruption* extends over the whole soul, and renders it unable to turn to God, or to do any thing truly good, and exposes it to his righteous displeasure,

both in this world and that which is to come." According to this, the guilt of Adam's sin involves all mankind in that corruption which extends over the whole soul: and according to your argument, *all mankind* shall be made alive in Christ in the *same manner* as they died in Adam: *ergo*, ALL MANKIND SHALL BE SO MADE ALIVE IN CHRIST THAT HOLINESS SHALL EXTEND OVER THE WHOLE SOUL! AMEN! Sir, shall I claim you as a Universalist?

The Apostle Paul says, 2d Cor. 15, 17. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." If unnumbered millions of *deaths* were suffered in Adam, and if "As in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ, shall all be made alive," THEN EVERY SPECIES OF DEATH WOULD BE SWALLOWED UP IN EVERLASTING VICTORY, AND ALL THINGS BE MADE NEW! "THEN COMETH THE END, WHEN HE (CHRIST) SHALL HAVE DELIVERED UP THE KINGDOM TO GOD, EVEN THE FATHER; WHEN HE SHALL HAVE PUT DOWN ALL RULE, AND ALL AUTHORITY AND POWER. THEN ALL THINGS SHALL BE SUBDUED UNTO HIM, THEN SHALL THE SON ALSO BE SUBJECT UNTO HIM THAT PUT ALL THINGS UNDER HIM, THAT GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL! ALLELUIA: SALVATION, AND GLORY, AND HONOUR, AND POWER, UNTO THE LORD OUR GOD"!!!

The opinion you advanced concerning the resurrection to damnation, and the final misery of some of those who will have been made alive in Christ, is manifestly incorrect. You quoted a passage from the prophecy of Daniel, one from the book of Revelations, and one from the 5th chapter of St. John's gospel, to confirm your opinion on this subject. These passages fall far short of any *evidence* for your opinion. They do not relate to a resurrection into a future world, but to a moral resurrection in this life. You seemed to lay great stress upon the passage in St. John's gospel: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This passage you quoted, at least, *five* times. Can it be possible sir that the phrase, "*resurrection of damnation*," in the sense you understood it, could have been congenial with your feelings on that occasion? I really hope not. Should the clay-cold hand of death be suddenly laid upon the dear companion of your bosom, should the grim, remorseless monster mark his lovely victim for the grave, should your heart be wrung with the keenest anguish which human nature can endure; what would be your sensations to have a professed messenger of truth and consolation, dwell with zeal upon the horrors of hell, and the never ending damnation of the *wicked*; especially when you must admit, that the being for whom you would mourn, had not always been free from sin? Such, sir, was the condition in which the bereaved Mr. Waters was placed, under your ministration, *not of the spirit which giveth life*; BUT OF THE LETTER, WHICH BY YOUR INTERPRETATION, KILLETH WITH ENDLESS DEATH. I pledge myself sir, to prove that the passage in the fifth of John relates only to a moral resurrection *in this life*.—This I will do, whenever you desire.—For a brief, though explicit illustration of this passage, I refer you to the eleventh No. of the present volume of the Herald. Speaking of the resurrection into a future world, the Apostle Paul says, "It is raised in *incorruption*—*in glory*—*in power*—*a spiritual body*." If a state, nature and condition thus defined, would not exempt mankind from misery; I cannot conceive what would afford such exemption. "This corruptible must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY. O DEATH! WHERE IS THY STING? O GRAVE! WHERE IS THY VICTORY"?

I now draw to a close. I have not questioned your integrity. Towards you, I feel not the least personal animosity.—On the contrary, I respect you as a man, a neighbor, a friend, and a sincere, though mistaken christian. I have addressed myself to you, sir, as to a man of understanding. While perusing this letter; forget not Philip's interrogatory address to the Ethiopian Eunuch, "*Understandest thou what thou readest?*" I must say, I do really pity you sir, in the condition, in which you will find yourself placed, when your glaring absurdities, presented in this letter, shall stare you in the face; and I do humbly hope that you will find it your duty to abandon a system, which no man

can defend, which harrows the souls of the afflicted with nameless agonies, which disgraces the character of Jehovah, and which every good man sincerely prays might be false.

With sentiments of affection and esteem, I am dear Sir, your friend and fellow-heir of incorruptible, immortal, glorious and endless life. PITT MORSE.

STRICTURES UPON A SERMON ENTITLED "FUTURE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, THE SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BEFORE THE NEW-ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF METHODIST MINISTERS, PROVIDENCE JUNE 17, 1823. BY REV. WILBUR FISK. A. M."

Continued from page 162. No. 21.

We now come to Mr. F's. second general proposition, which is as follows, "Because God renders to every man according to his works, he is therefore, a God of mercy. That is, his mercy, as well as his other attributes, is interested in the righteous retribution of his gracious rewards and condign punishments." Mr. F. says, "It is questioned whether it is consistent with the mercy of a benevolent God, to inflict a punishment which is not designed to benefit those who are punished. Or whether it is consistent with the mercy of God, to inflict upon the wicked an endless punishment. This is the point at issue. In opposition to what has been advanced, in the foregoing discourse, it is asserted that all punishment is disciplinary. A merciful God, it is said can inflict no other. Most of the objections brought against the eternal punishment of the wicked, are founded on this argument. And from this argument, the final salvation of all men is inferred. But is this good reasoning? It is certainly contrary to the modern, and almost universally received principles of philosophising. The path struck out by Bacon, and successfully followed by Newton, is to trace facts up to first principles, and not to assume first principles, and from these infer facts." We not only *assert* that all the punishment which God inflicts is *disciplinary*, and regards the final good of the sufferer, but we *prove* it also. Omitting, at this time, the reasoning which might be used upon this important point, we appeal directly to the scriptures. Heb. 12. 8 to 11 inclusive, "But if ye be without chastisement *whereof all are partakers*, then are ye bastards and not sons. Furthermore we have had Fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of our spirits and live? For *they* verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but *he for our profit*, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening *for the present* seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless *afterwards* it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." If sinners should be punished or chastised without end; would it not be utterly impossible that their chastisement should "*afterwards* yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby?" But Mr. F. says, "Is this good reasoning?" The reader will judge. Mr. F. would have us "trace facts up to first principles; and not assume first principles; and from these infer facts." The reader will be careful to notice that the "first principle" here referred to, is the *mercy* of God. Now what *fact* would Mr. F. assume? What would he wish to have us take for *fact* on this subject? Answer. He would have us admit that the endless misery of the wicked is a *fact*; then we may labour to reconcile this assumed *fact*, with the mercy of God! The doctrine of endless misery is not a fact. It is not even mentioned in the word of God. It has been refuted times without number; and is disproved by all the works of God.

Again Mr. F. says, "If God had made no revelation to us in any way, concerning the punishment of the wicked, we must have been entirely ignorant with regard to it. But he has made a revelation, in which, as we have seen," (perhaps Mr. F. would do well to look over this subject again,) "the weight of argument proves that the *finally impenitent* will forever be excluded from heaven." We would here just observe that the scriptures do not say that any will be "*finally impenitent*."—They mention no such characters. But Mr. F. says, "This weight of argument, however great it may appear, must all be set aside, according to the system objected to, because such punishment is inconsistent with the character of God. But how is this proved? Has God ever said so?" We answer, yes. Lam. 3, 31, 32. "*For the Lord will not cast off forever: but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.*" Again, Mr. F. says, "The

scriptures doom the sinner to hell, and there they leave him. They make no provision for his escape." This is a very great mistake. Ps. 86, 13. "For great is thy mercy towards me; and *thou hast delivered* my soul from the *lowest hell.*" If there be a deliverance from the *lowest hell;* surely no hell less awful, or less deep will retain its subjects to the unlimited ages of eternity. We learn from the scriptures, not only that there is deliverance from hell, but that *hell* itself shall be destroyed. Those therefore, who would build up and support *hell* to all eternity, must either be disappointed and frustrated or they must successfully oppose *almighty power!* Hosea 13, 14. "I will ransom them from the power of (*hades*) the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O (*hades*) grave, I will be thy *destruction*; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." *Hades* is usually translated *hell.* God therefore says, "O *hell*, I will be thy destruction"!—When this prophecy shall have been fulfilled, and *hell* totally and ultimately destroyed, we presume it will be satisfactorily ascertained that the never-ceasing continuance of *hell* is not so *necessary* as many now seem to imagine.

Mr. F. says, "God's attributes, it is acknowledged, are all interested in *all* his works. We may as well say that God is divided, as to say that one acts without the other. And we may as well say he is at war with himself, as to say that one acts in opposition to the other. The demands of his justice are not unsatisfied in the salvation of the believer; neither is the display of mercy excluded in the punishment of the impenitent. But God acts upon the scale of general good. And is there no way that he can display his mercy in the punishment of the wicked, except he show mercy to those who are punished? There is, if we believe the Psalmist. In the 136th psalm he gives thanks "to him that smote Egypt in their first born, *for his* MERCY *endureth forever*—that overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea, *for his mercy endureth forever.*" But why were those events a proof that God's mercy endureth forever? Not because there was any mixture of mercy towards the Egyptians, but because by this destruction of their enemies, he wrought a *merciful* deliverance for his people."

According to the above, the *general good* requires that God should be infinitely *partial*—that he should be merciful to some, and unmerciful to others! If the *general good* of the universe requires the endless suffering of half mankind, then the *general evil* would require the eternal felicity of half mankind: *ergo*, the *general good* and the *general evil* of the universe are one and the same!!! So much for Mr. F.'s view of the general good, according to which he supposes God to act. If there were no "mixture of mercy towards the Egyptians," then God's justice stands opposed to his mercy. If God's justice and mercy cannot both be exercised towards the same subjects, then we may justly say, "he is at war with himself." The justice of God is unsatisfied in the salvation of the believer, if the believer ever did deserve *endless* punishment.—Mercy is excluded from the sinner, if he be punished without end. If the mercy of God be finally excluded from any sinner then the mercy of God is *limited.* Mr. F. quoted from the 135th psalm, "For the *mercy* of the *Lord endureth forever.*" Mr. F. will unquestionably admit that the above language concerning the *duration* of the divine mercy, should be taken in an *unlimited* sense. Then if the mercy of God ever did extend to the Egyptians, it will always extend to them, "for his mercy endureth forever." But Mr. F. after admitting the *immutability* of the divine *mercy*, would so *limit* it as to allow that there was no "mixture of mercy towards the Egyptians" and others! Hence our Methodist brother assumes the very position which Methodists consider so abominable in Calvinism, viz. *that God unfeelingly gives existence to rational, dependent beings, excludes them from his mercy for ever, and pours out his vengeance upon them to countless millions of ages, even to all eternity!* Mr. F. agrees with the Psalmist that "the mercy of the Lord endureth forever." We have now only to determine the extent of the divine mercy. Ps. 145, 9. "*His tender mercies are over all his works;*" consequently the *tender mercies* of God are over the Egyptians and others named by Mr. F; and as "his mercy endureth for ever," all rational creatures will eternally be the subjects of divine grace. We therefore have no "scripture proof, that God does inflict punishment that is not disciplinary:" we have proof positive that no other than disciplinary punishment ever will be inflicted.

Again Mr. F. says, "That motive must

originate in the divine goodness the tendency and design of which is to prevent sin. Now the *penalty* of God's law is held up to the subject of God's moral government, to prevent sin, therefore this penalty must be founded in the divine goodness. If such motives are not necessary in the government of God, why does he make use of them? Why are they found in the bible? Either the bible must be given up or else it must be acknowledged such motives are necessary." If God intended to prevent sin, why is it supposed that he ever made a law requiring the endless continuance of sin and suffering! *The penalty of the law.* What is the penalty of the law? Mr. F. would have us understand that endless misery is the penalty of the law. We would inform Mr. F. that the bible does not inform us that endless suffering is the *penalty* of the law. If it were, all must finally be damned, "for all have sinned!" Can there be a greater absurdity than to suppose that a penalty of endless woe, can be "founded in the divine goodness?" The following propositions are something like the above. God from all eternity designed to save those who would accept of the terms contained in the plan of salvation. Notwithstanding this eternal design, God gave man a law, knowing it would be broken, the *penalty* of which, subjects man to endless woe. Now how were those whom God eternally designed to save, ever subjected to endless woe? Could God destine the same beings, both to heaven and to hell for ever? Poor short sighted man! What difficulties dost thou encounter by forsaking simple truth and common sense! "The bible" need not be "given up:" but the doctrine of endless misery must be given up.

Mr. F. says, "And it must be allowed, the greater the penalty the stronger the motive. The greatest penalty, therefore, which man can suffer, will operate when annexed to God's law, as the strongest motive of obedience." The fear of punishment is not the foundation of virtue. That service which is performed through fear of the punishment which awaits disobedience, springs not from the heart. There is a vast difference between the service rendered by the slave who stands in awe of the tyrant's rod; and that which is rendered by an obedient child to an affectionate parent. He who serves God through fear of punishment *only*, is a wicked man. Why? Because his heart (to which God looks,) delights in sin; and really desires to commit it. Nothing but the fear of damnation restrains him. The love of God and of holiness is the foundation of virtue and moral purity. He who loves God and holiness, has no relish for sin, and would not commit it if there were no punishment for crime. But while we admit that punishment, is necessary, in the divine administration; we do not "allow the greater the penalty, the stronger the motive" to obedience. The *severity* and *duration* of the punishment threatened are not all that should be taken into the account to determine its influence on the human mind. The *certainty* of punishment must also be considered. When sinners are informed that they deserve eternal misery for their crimes, *provided* they do not repent: this *provision* destroys the terror designed to be inspired. Nearly the whole influence of such awful punishment is lost because it is not *certain*; it *may be avoided*. Hence those who make the strongest, loudest *professions* of faith in the eternity of hell torments, live as though they believed it not; they live like those who totally reject a sentiment so horrid. So far therefore, as punishment will tend to restrain vice; that which is limited, adequate and *certain*, will have the best effect.

Again, Mr. F. says, "The known principles of God's administration, in the moral government of the world involves suffering; and this suffering, all acknowledge is in consequence of sin." All *punishment* is in consequence of sin: but all *suffering* is not *punishment*. The following we consider weak indeed. Mr. F. says, "If suffering for sin then, in some degree, is not inconsistent with God's goodness, who can determine when or where that suffering must stop, lest it should encroach upon that goodness? God has taught us by his administration; that sin deserves and receives punishment. For myself, I know of no argument, drawn from the mercy, love or goodness of God, against eternal punishment, but will, in principle, bear with equal force against any degree of punishment; and indeed against every kind of suffering." Every person of common understanding can determine that suffering must stop short of eternity, or it must encroach upon the goodness of God. God has never determined that punishment shall be endless. Certainly he has

not communicated such determination to man. But Mr. F. says, "For myself I know of no argument" &c. This is well expresed, Mr. F. knows of no argument; but that does not prove there is none. The amount of Mr. F's. proposition is this. Every argument against eternal punishment, drawn from the goodness of God, will bear with equal force against any degree of punishment, and every kind of suffering. We will illustrate this by a similitude No one it is presumed, will deny but that it is both just and merciful to amputate a man's limb; when the amputation of a limb would free the man from pain, restore him to health and furnish him with many blessings which he could not otherwise receive. According to Mr. F's. argument,if it be right for the surgeon to subject his patient to *temporary* suffering; it would be equally just and right for him to torture his patient all the days of his life: yea if he had the power he might mangle and torment his victim to the never ending ages of eternity!!! This argument,we trust Mr. F. can understand. Again, according to Mr. F. if he can live without food one day he can live without food to all eternity! All the consequences which Mr. F. attempts to draw from the above premises, are as incorrect and absurd as his premises are untrue. Mr. F. introduces an important objection against his position,in the following words, "Limited suffering is consistent with God's goodness, because he will overrule all for the good of the sufferers." In reply to this objection Mr. F. answers thus. 1. "This destroys entirely the penal sanctions of God,s law. It is saying to man, if you transgress, you shall be punished in such a measure, and to such a degree, as shall in the end, make you the happier for all your suffering. Who does not see that this is holding out a reward for transgression, rather than a penalty? 2. Could not God have made man just as happy without causing him to suffer at all? If you say he could not, you limit his power; if you say that he has the power but not the will, you limit his goodness." Under the government of a perfect Being, all things must necessarily result in the greatest possible good of all creatures. A result finally *evil* to any dependent creature,would argue *imperfection* in the Disposer of all ngs. We think limited punishmeut to compatible with the divine goodness, cause overruled for the good of the sufferers: because the divine grace and goodness extends beyond all possible suffering. Is it necessary to say to man, "if you transgress, you shall be punished" without mercy and without end? If it be necessary to say this; it is necessary to tell them that which is *not true:* for *some* transgressors at least may and will be saved! Must God have such a *penalty* to his law as will render the existence of his disobedient children an *endless curse*; or have no penalty at all? Why does a good Being give life to those who will be eternally miserable? Because God has not attached *endless* woe as the penalty of his law, it does not follow that he has attached no penalty at all. If sinners be taught that they shall receive a punishment adequate to their deeds; it could not destroy the reality of that punishment to state, as the scriptures do, that it shall result in the good of those who are subjected to it.—The final result of all things should be attributed to the Supreme Ruler of the universe, if therefore, the final doom of any rational creature be misery, to that creature God is a *malignant* Being! We have already refuted the notion that this argument will equally apply to *temporary* misery. [*To be Continued.*]

REMARKABLE ILLUSTATION OF THE TRINITY.

In a modern periodical work, published in London, called "The Free Thinking Christian's Magazine,' No. 7, are found the following paragraphs under the title—

"*DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.*"

"Lightfoot, in commenting upon some portions of the Old Testament, says—'Some three months after this, the three persons of the trinity dine with Abraham. The Son and Holy Ghost go down to Sodom, but the first person of the trinity stayeth with Abraham.'"

An "Allegorical Picture of the Battle of Waterloo," by *Ward*, was recently exhibited in London. In the description which was sold in the exhibition room, occurred the explanation of the '*The Union Jack.*' 'Wellington has his hand on the tri-colored cross on the shield of Britannia, expressive of the Chieftain's emblem;—the three colors of which it is composed, being answerable to the three persons in the trinity. *Red* is the first, or fiery principle in the Godhead. Blue, the second, is the Saviour or Mediator.—White, the third, is the Dove of Peace."

In the first of theseparagraphs the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are represented to be three as distinct beings, as three angels, or three men. In the second, the Father of mercies, the source of love and goodness, is represented as a "*fiery* principle in the Godhead"—indeed as an odious character when compared with the Son and Holy Spirit!

To such absurd and debasing views of the Supreme Being, chiefly, have men been led, by departing from the simple language of the gospel, and by adopting, as an article of faith, a form of words unknown to any inspired writer, and unintelligible to the human mind.—*Christian Register.*

LOVE.

Experience abundantly warrants the assertion, that we cannot love what appears unamiable, or hate what appears lovely; hence it is impossible to love God, while he seems dark and unlovely: while he shows no sympathy for us, and while we can discover no expansion of soul or light of mind in pondering his works. His paternal character must be seen, his love to his creatures must be felt, or they can never revere him in their souls or make it the business of their existence to resemble him. The goodness or love of God, and that only, leads to repentance, moral improvement, and heavenly joy; consequently it should be held up in all the strength in which men can display it, that the sinner may be softened, reclaimed, and established in the path of virtue and happiness. Mistaken views of God and his revelation have filled the christian world with gloom, as misapprehensions of the true Divinity filled the Pagan world with blood, fire, slaughter, and untameable ferocity. If any would preach a religion that shall unite hearts and spread a cloudless day over the moral world, let him present christianity in its native loveliness, as the image of its divine author, and God will recognize its heavenly origin in the blessings that shall accompanay and follow its triumph.—*Rel. Inq.*

Slander.—Against slander there is no defence. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplore so fell a foe: It is with a word—with a nod—with a look—with a smile: it is the pestilence walking in darkness, spreading contagion far and wide, which the most wary traveller cannot avoid. It is the heart-searching dagger of the assassin.—It is the poisoned arrow whose wound is incurable.—It is the mortal sting of the deadly adder.—*Murder* is its employment—*Innocence* its prey—and *Ruin* its sport.

ORIGINAL ANECDOTE.

ST. PAUL A CALVINISTIC BAPTIST!

A member of a Baptist church in the town of G. lately asserted, in the hearing of a number of persons, that St. Paul was a *Calvinist Baptist.* Should St. Paul, said he, arise from the dead, and preach in our meeting-house, no one knowing the man or his sentiments, and should the inquiry be made after meeting—"What denomination was the preacher of? the universal answer would be—"He is a Baptist." A lady, sitting by, thought that it would require as great a miracle to make a *Baptist of St. Paul,* as it would to raise him from the dead, and introduce him into the meeting-house in G. But, continued she, should St. Paul deliver a discourse in this place, and affirm from the pulpit that "God would have all men to be saved—that he would gather together all things in Christ;" what denomination should you conclude he belonged to? The Baptist not knowing these were Paul's words, answered, "Paul would know too well to preach such a licentious doctrine as that!" But suppose he should so preach, resumed the lady, what should you call him? "Why I should say he was a despicable *Universalist;* and if he so preached I should leave the house immediately!" The lady presented him with a Bible, opened to those places in Paul's writings. He looked at them and exclaimed, "Ah! you have got a *Universalist Bible, which ought to be burned; if you hear to such delusion as that, you must be forever miserable.*"—Comment is unnecessary.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

TO OUR PATRONS.

Mr. JOHN FAY is appointed general agent for the collection of monies due, both for the first and second volumes of the Herald. Local agents as well as individual subscribers, are therefore requested to make payments to him.

As the second volume is drawing to a close, those who have not paid, are requested to perform this part of their duty without unnecessary delay.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT WATERTOWN N. Y. AT $1 00 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.